

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA



THESIS

THE EFFECTS OF MARRIAGE ON THE COHESION OF FLEET MARINE FORCE UNITS: AN OFFICER'S PERSPECTIVE

by

Stephen A. Lawson

December 1996

Thesis Co-Advisors:

Alice Crawford
Mark J. Eitelberg

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19970923 014

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE | | | Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188 | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503. | | | | |
| 1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank) | | 2. REPORT DATE December 1996 | | 3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE THE EFFECTS OF MARRAGE ON THE COHESION OF FLEET MARINE FORCE UNITS: AN OFFICER'S PERSPECTIVE | | | 5. FUNDING NUMBERS | |
| 6. AUTHOR(S) Lawson, Stephen A. | | | | |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey CA 93943-5000 | | | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER | |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) | | | 10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER | |
| 11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government. | | | | |
| 12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. | | | 12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE | |
| 13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) This thesis examines the perceived effects of marriage on the cohesion of Fleet Marine Force units. Focused interviews were conducted with 25 Marine officers. All interviews were audio taped and then transcribed. Analysis of the transcripts revealed 11 general themes. These themes covered many topics, including how spouse affect Fleet Marine Force Units, the connection between living in barracks and cohesion, the contrast between single and married Marines, and the judgment of junior enlisted Marines concerning marriage. A major finding drawn from the themes is that the Marine Corps must continue to strive for a deeper understanding of the relationship between marriage and cohesion and how the relationship affects Fleet Marine Force units. | | | | |
| 14. SUBJECT TERMS MARRIAGE AND UNIT COHESION, MARRIAGE IN THE MARINE CORPS, UNIT COHESION IN THE MARINE CORPS | | | 15. NUMBER OF PAGES 82 | |
| | | | 16. PRICE CODE | |
| 17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified | 18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified | 19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified | 20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL | |

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18 298-102

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

**THE EFFECTS OF MARRIAGE ON THE COHESION OF FLEET
MARINE FORCE UNITS: AN OFFICER'S PERSPECTIVE**

Stephen A. Lawson
Captain, United States Marine Corps
B.A., Miami University, 1991

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of


MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL


December 1996

Author:




Stephen A. Lawson


Approved by:



Alice Crawford, Thesis Co-Advisor



Mark J. Eitelberg, Thesis Co-Advisor



Reuben T. Harris, Chairman

Department of Systems Management

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the perceived effects of marriage on the cohesion of Fleet Marine Force units. Focused interviews were conducted with 25 Marine officers. All interviews were audio taped and then transcribed. Analysis of the transcripts revealed 11 general themes. These themes covered many topics, including how spouses affect Fleet Marine Force units, the connection between living in barracks and cohesion, the contrast between single and married Marines, and the judgment of junior enlisted Marines concerning marriage. A major finding drawn from the themes is that the Marine Corps must continue to strive for a deeper understanding of the relationship between marriage and cohesion and how the relationship affects Fleet Marine Force units.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A. | BACKGROUND | 1 |
| B. | PURPOSE OF THE STUDY | 3 |
| C. | SCOPE/METHODOLOGY | 4 |
| D. | BENEFIT OF THE STUDY | 4 |
| E. | ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS | 5 |
| II. | LITERATURE REVIEW | 7 |
| A. | INTRODUCTION | 7 |
| B. | HISTORY OF MARRIAGE IN THE MILITARY | 7 |
| C. | MARINE CORPS FAMILY LIFE | 12 |
| 1. | The Marine Corps Base | 14 |
| D. | MISSION AND ROLE OF THE FLEET MARINE FORCE | 16 |
| E. | OFFICER SELECTION OF A MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTY (MOS) | 17 |
| F. | COHESION | 19 |
| 1. | Organizational Characteristics | 22 |
| 2. | Small Group and Unit Characteristics | 22 |
| 3. | Leadership Characteristics | 24 |
| G. | CONCLUSION | 24 |
| III. | METHODOLOGY | 25 |
| A. | DATA COLLECTION | 25 |
| B. | DATA ANALYSIS AND THEME DEVELOPMENT | 27 |

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| IV. | RESULTS | 29 |
| A. | OVERVIEW | 29 |
| B. | THEME I: THE TIME A UNIT SPENDS TOGETHER IS THE MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENT TO BUILDING A COHESIVE UNIT | 29 |
| C. | THEME II: BARRACKS ARE NOT CONDUCIVE TO BUILDING COHESION IN UNITS | 30 |
| D. | THEME III: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARRIED AND SINGLE MARINES IN FMF UNITS IS GOOD | 31 |
| E. | THEME IV: MARITAL PROBLEMS CAN AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF MARRIED MARINES IN THE FMF | 31 |
| F. | THEME V: IN STRESSFUL SITUATIONS MARRIED PERSONNEL PERFORM NO DIFFERENTLY THAN SINGLE PERSONNEL | 32 |
| G. | THEME VI: SPOUSES CAN AFFECT THE UNIT | 32 |
| H. | THEME VII: THE INDOCTRINATION OF SPOUSES TO THE MARINE CORPS AND ITS WAY OF LIFE IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF A SUCCESSFUL MARINE CORPS MARRIAGE | 33 |
| I. | THEME VIII: FAMILIES ARE THE PRIMARY INFLUENCE ON A MARRIED MARINE'S BEHAVIOR, NOT THE MARINE CORPS | 33 |
| J. | THEME IX: DEALING WITH MARRIED MARINES IS A LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE | 34 |
| K. | THEME X: THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARRIAGE AND COHESION | 35 |
| L. | THEME XI: THE MAJORITY OF INTERVIEWEES DO NOT TRUST THE JUDGMENT OF JUNIOR MARINES WHEN IT COMES TO MARRIAGE | 35 |
| V. | ANALYSIS | 37 |
| A. | OVERVIEW | 37 |
| B. | THEME I: THE TIME A UNIT SPENDS TOGETHER IS THE MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENT IN BUILDING A COHESIVE UNIT | 37 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| C. | THEME II: BARRACKS ARE NOT CONDUCTIVE TO BUILDING COHESION IN UNITS | 39 |
| D. | THEME III: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARRIED AND SINGLE MARINES IN FMF UNITS IS GOOD | 41 |
| E. | THEME IV: MARITAL PROBLEMS CAN AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF MARRIED MARINES IN THE FMF | 42 |
| F. | THEME V: IN STRESSFUL SITUATIONS, MARRIED PERSONNEL PERFORM NO DIFFERENTLY THAN SINGLE PERSONNEL | 43 |
| G. | THEME VI: SPOUSES CAN AFFECT THE UNIT | 44 |
| H. | THEME VII: THE INDOCTRINATION OF SPOUSES TO THE MARINE CORPS AND ITS WAY OF LIFE IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF A SUCCESSFUL MARINE CORPS MARRIAGE | 45 |
| I. | THEME VIII: FAMILIES ARE THE PRIMARY INFLUENCE ON A MARRIED MARINE'S BEHAVIOR, NOT THE MARINE CORPS | 46 |
| J. | THEME IX: DEALING WITH MARRIED MARINES IS A LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE | 47 |
| K. | THEME X: THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARRIAGE AND COHESION | 49 |
| L. | THEME XI: THE MAJORITY OF INTERVIEWEES DO NOT TRUST THE JUDGMENT OF JUNIOR MARINES WHEN IT COMES TO MARRIAGE | 50 |
| VI. | CONCLUSION | 53 |
| A. | CONCLUSIONS | 53 |
| B. | POTENTIAL AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH | 53 |
| 1. | The Marine Corps Must Make Marriage More Culturally Acceptable | 54 |
| 2. | Marines of All Ranks, Whether Single or Married, Need to Undergo Marriage-related Training | 55 |
| APPENDIX A. | DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE | 57 |
| APPENDIX B. | DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTY (MOS) | 59 |

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|----|
| APPENDIX C. | INTERVIEW QUESTIONS | 61 |
| APPENDIX D. | INTERVIEW TEMPLATE | 63 |
| APPENDIX E. | THEMES DEVELOPED FROM INTERVIEWS | 65 |
| LIST OF REFERENCES | | 67 |
| INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST. | | 69 |

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Military leaders have long struggled with the demands of civilians who were dependent upon members of their force. As Marine Major Robert Bruggemann, an infantry officer, observes:

Mercenary armies of the 17th Century had to contend with large numbers of people reliant on the army for their existence, and, as a result, men who commanded these armies had a multitude of responsibilities besides leading their forces into battle. For example, one army had 50,000 civilians accompanying its 25,000 soldiers. The individual soldier was supported by dependents, servants, camp-followers, and others. These armies continued to grow as newborn infants arrived weekly to compound the problem. One army employed by the Hapsburg Empire grew by six or seven newborns each week . . . therefore, it is inaccurate to think that armies throughout the centuries have been composed of single men who simply marched forth to battle with only a sword or gun. [Ref. 1: p. 3]

Marriage is one of the most important decisions that a person will make in the course of his or her life. Because people, not weapons, are the Marine Corps' most important assets, the quality of a Marine's married life is of great concern to the Corps. Although marriage rates are apparently decreasing among civilians, these rates have been rising among Marines over the past fifteen years.

As Navy Chaplain E.T. Gomulka, a former Deputy Chaplain for the Marine Corps, states:

In 1980, 33.9% of Marines were married. Five years later, that number increased to 44.4%. Today, some 48.6% of Marines are married. Although civilian divorce rates have decreased slightly since 1980, divorces among Marines over the past twelve years have increased by 76.8%. The number among junior enlisted Marines, Private through Lance Corporal and junior Non-Commissioned Officers (NCOs), Corporals, is even higher. For example, while 701 Marines in this category divorced in 1980 by 1992 that had increased to 1,416 (+117%). Studies show that military personnel tend to remarry sooner than their civilian counterparts. Since a number of remarriages occur when both partners are still "on the rebound," it is not surprising to learn that 40% of military second marriages end in divorce within the first five years of the second marriage. [Ref. 10: p. 7]

The defense downsizing of the early 1990s led to a reduction of active duty infantry battalions in the Fleet Marine Force (FMF) from a total of twenty-seven to twenty-four. As a result,

Marines face an increased operational tempo which, in turn, require augmenting the manpower and resources used to support dependents of Marines during deployments. The Department of Defense (DoD) has obligated \$2.7 billion over the period from 1996 through 2001 (\$450 million per year) to fund "quality of life" initiatives. [Ref. 17: p. 51] Many Marines, however, still view the growing number of Marine dependents (188,314 as of September 30, 1995) [Ref. 15: p. 26] as a burden and a drain upon scarce financial resources.

Marine Corps leaders were particularly distressed in recent years over the number of Marines who did not deploy with their units or returned early from deployments due to family difficulties (e.g., sick spouse, marital difficulties). As a response to this and other related concerns, the Marine Corps unveiled All Marine Message (ALMAR) 226/93 in August 1993. The ALMAR was designed to gradually end the recruitment of married individuals and provide counseling for Marines who planned on getting married.

The announcement of ALMAR 226/93 was met by a great deal of opposition. The new policy was incorrectly viewed by many as "anti-family." The media presented it as an attempt to prevent enlisted Marines from marrying. The policy was eventually rescinded, and a major DoD study was undertaken to review service-wide issues regarding the marital status of first-term enlistees. [Ref. 1: p. 5] The Marine Corps later implemented portions of ALMAR 226/93 related to marriage counseling and educational programs. Still, as Bruggemann observes, the Marine Corps has "not aggressively pursued a solution that would decrease the number of marriages in its first-term force." [Ref. 1: p. 7]

There are generally two schools of thought concerning marriage in the Marine Corps. The first sees marriage as a Constitutionally-guaranteed right and as a source of comfort, security, and

stability in a profession fraught with peril. The second school views marriage, especially among junior enlisted personnel, as a drain on manpower, destroyer of unit cohesion, diminisher of operational effectiveness and performance, and devourer of scarce financial resources. Officers and Staff Non-Commissioned Officers (SNCOs), it is said, often find themselves overwhelmed dealing with the marital problems of their Marines and related tasks that they are not trained to handle. Support for this view comes from the high divorce rate among junior enlisted Marines. As Major T.R. Fey, a former infantry company commander, writes:

Personnel problems top the list of burdens on today's leaders . . . we institutionally encourage young Marines to get married. The extent of the encouragement is so great that it becomes nearly inconvenient not to marry. We provide those who marry with better housing, more money, more benefits, and more time off. Many of our Marines are not prepared for marriage. The contract is viewed as a form of "advanced dating" that lacks commitment or responsibility. The results of many of these marriages produce stories so bizarre that they defy believability. [Ref. 7: p. 46]

B. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this thesis is to explore whether the institution of marriage has an effect on the cohesion of active-duty FMF units, as seen through the eyes of Marine Corps officers. Does marriage affect day-to-day operations, training objectives, and operational readiness? Do perceptions of the relationship between marriage and unit cohesion differ between married and single officers, or between male and female officers? Do spouses affect unit operations? These are a few of the questions this thesis seeks to answer. A secondary objective is to examine the nature of the relationship between marriage and unit cohesion--specifically, whether it is adverse or beneficial to the operation of FMF units.

C. SCOPE/METHODOLOGY

This thesis focuses on the perceived relationship between marriage and cohesion in FMF units. Marine officers who served in the FMF were interviewed for their views regarding the effect of marriage on day-to-day routines, training objectives, operational readiness, esprit de corps, and mission preparedness of units. Because of time constraints and a lack of qualified participants, certain topics, such as the issue of single parenting in the Marine Corps and the effect of marriage upon the cohesion of Marine Corps Reserve Units, were excluded from this study.

The study commenced with a comprehensive literature review (Chapter II) to provide a broad background on cohesion and marriage in the military. Data were then collected through focused interviews. The interviews, in conjunction with the literature review, permitted a subjective analysis of the issue.

The interviews focused on Marine Corps officers, both married and single, male and female, between the ranks of First Lieutenant (O-2) and Lieutenant-Colonel (O-5) who had completed at least one tour in the FMF. All subjects were given the same interview regardless of rank, military occupational specialty (MOS), or marital status.

D. BENEFIT OF THE STUDY

Through this thesis, the researcher seeks to explore the possible effect of marriage on the cohesion of FMF units, as perceived by Marine Corps officers. Furthermore, the study attempts to determine whether marriage exercises an adverse or beneficial impact on the operation of these units. The "lessons learned" from this research should identify deficiencies that warrant correction or opportunities that can be further pursued.

E. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This thesis attempts to build a foundation for future research regarding marriage and cohesion in the Marine Corps. Chapter II presents background information ranging from a brief history of marriage in the United States military to an overview of cohesion. Chapter III discusses the research methodology, data analysis, and theme development in the thesis. In Chapter IV, the survey results are presented in theme-style format. Chapter V presents an analysis of the themes developed in the previous chapter along with supporting excerpts from the interviews. Chapter VI discusses major conclusions drawn from the findings, and presents recommendations based upon the study. The thesis also contains five appendices. Appendix A presents a demographic breakdown of the survey participants. Appendix B details the MOSs of survey participants. Appendix C lists the questions used in the interviews. Appendix D is a copy of the template used to transcribe interviewees' responses. And, Appendix E lists the themes that were developed during the course of the interviews.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. INTRODUCTION

A review of several topics--the history of marriage in the military, Marine Corps family life, the mission and role of the FMF, officer MOS selection, and cohesion--was undertaken to assist in framing the study and establishing a context for the focused interviews. These topics are briefly discussed below.

B. HISTORY OF MARRIAGE IN THE MILITARY

The story of the United States military begins with the American Revolution and the formation of the Continental Army. For most of its existence, the U.S. military kept a large majority of its members single, prohibiting the enlistment of men with dependents, discouraging marriage, and providing an atmosphere that favored bachelors. Families were seen as a distraction that competed with service in the military. The low pay and lack of services for military personnel, especially those in the enlisted ranks, discouraged marriage-minded men from making the military their career. It should be noted, however, that such circumstances applied only to the peacetime military. In time of war or other national emergency, the military was usually opened to persons normally excluded from service during peacetime. Nations at war generally cannot afford to restrict the population of eligible combatants. [Ref. 6: p. 2-2]

During the Revolutionary War, little heed was given to the marital status of soldiers. Any man who was fit to fight was eligible to serve in the Continental Army. As would be

expected, there was little in the way of social services for the families of married colonial soldiers. With the husband-father away at war, life was especially hard on the family. In 1779, George Washington was authorized to increase the rewards of married soldiers, recognizing that these men had families to support. This marked one of the first instances of the government providing social services to married service men. [Ref. 6: p. 2-2]

After the Revolutionary War, military leaders did not seem overly concerned with soldiers marrying and raising families, so there were no regulations preventing them from doing so. At the same time, the military and its leaders did not create an environment conducive to rearing a family (e.g., low pay, few facilities at outposts). This remained the case for the next 70 years. [Ref. 4: p. 25] In 1847, the Army issued the following regulation regarding new enlistees:

No man having a wife or child shall be enlisted in time of peace without special authority from the General Headquarters through the Superintendent. This rule is not to apply to soldiers who "reenlist." [Ref. 6: p. 2-3]

If the rough and inhospitable conditions of life on the American Frontier could not dissuade prospective applicants from joining, the above regulation surely did. The standing force at the time was relatively small and, during peacetime, military leaders were generally inflexible about granting waivers allowing married men to enlist. This regulation, however, could be circumvented by the enlistee concealing or deceiving his seniors of the fact that he was married.

With the onset of the Civil War and the urgent need for manpower, enlistment barriers were removed on both sides of the conflict. Again, any man considered fit for duty, regardless of his marital status, was permitted to serve. The North, however, did offer an

exemption to those drafted into service. The Union Enrollment Act offered exemptions to men for family hardship, including those who were "the father of motherless children less than 12 years of age dependent upon his labor for support." [Ref. 6: p. 2-3] Further rules that governed Union conscription deferred the induction of married men between the ages of 36 and 45. The Union Enrollment Act was later amended to eliminate exemptions for men with dependents and deferments for older married men due to the pressing demands of the war. [Ref. 6: p. 2-4]

After the war, the climate in the military again became inhospitable toward families. Dangerous, isolated postings and the lack of family quarters in garrisons, along with continuing regulations prohibiting the enlistment of married men, operated to keep the military, primarily the enlisted ranks, family free. [Ref. 9: p. 120-122] Officers were not discouraged from marrying, but they were dissuaded from marrying until they were at least thirty years of age (though there were no regulations governing this). The military's reasoning behind this was to allow young officers to focus on their duties and become proficient in their jobs. A 1972 study reports that,

In the Annapolis class of 1871, of 38 graduates who were on active duty in the early 1900's, at the time of the study, 31 had married 10 to 15 years after graduation. [Ref. 9: p. 123]

This contrasts with what occurred following World War II, when officers began to marry immediately following graduation from the academies. It should be noted that students in the service academies were forbidden to marry before graduation. Any who did so were disenrolled. This regulation remains in effect today. [Ref. 11: p. 14]

The U.S. military, post-Civil War, has been called an "army of deserters." [Ref. 9: p. 121] Men who enlisted for the first time had to state in writing that they were not married and had no children. The age requirement for enlistees in the late 1800s was 16-36 years of age with the term of enlistment being five years. Most enlisted men, however, never fulfilled their term of service. They simply deserted. In 1871, the Army lost 33 percent of its strength due to desertion, though this did decrease to just less than 10 percent by 1891. The Navy, by comparison, lost 18 percent of its strength to desertion in 1891. The reason most often cited for this was the legislation that discouraged enlisted servicemen from marrying:

The military personnel were compelled to wait past the age of thirty to be married and then the conditions for a family were very poor. Evidently, when the desire to marry came about, personnel considered it a viable solution to desert. [Ref. 6: p. 2-5]

By the early 1900s, military regulations governing the enlistment of married men began to relax. In 1913, the Army permitted recruiters to enlist married men if permission from a regimental commander or other commanding officer were obtained. In 1939, the War Department revised its regulations governing the recruitment of married men. It specifically barred the "original" enlistment of men with lawful wives or dependents in time of peace. [Ref. 6: p. 2-6]

The conscription of married men was delayed as long as possible during World War II, but, eventually, manpower demands made it difficult to offer any kind of deferment. In February 1942, the ban on married recruits was rescinded by the War Department in . . .

Enlistments and reenlistments in the Army of the United States of married men or men with dependents are authorized provided the applicant signs a statement that his dependents have sufficient means of support. [Ref. 6: p. 2-10]

In addition, the War Department rescinded regulations requiring enlisted men to secure their commanding officer's permission before they could marry.

The passage of Public Law 490 by the 77th Congress in 1942 provided benefits for dependents and set the stage for the post-World War II era where greater emphasis would be placed upon the well-being of dependents rather than whether or not enlisted men were married. As a recent article notes:

The services started thinking about quality of life. Then they started thinking about caring for the family. They felt if they did, they would attract and retain better soldiers. [Ref. 8: p. 61]

Soon after the war, the military began to relax its restrictions on enlisting men with dependents. By 1956, the Army authorized the enlistment of men with one dependent--but only if they attained a score of 65 or greater on the Armed Forces Qualification Test. Women, however, were still barred from enlisting if they were married or had dependents under the age of eighteen. This regulation disappeared in the early 1970s, with the Marine Corps as the last service to abolish it in 1974. [Ref. 6: p. 2-12]

At the end of the 1950s, regulations on male applicants had been relaxed even further. The Army allowed "men with no prior service and just one dependent" to enlist as long as they were "otherwise qualified." These changes eventually led to an increased proportion of married personnel. In 1953, approximately one-third of all enlisted men were married. The Marine Corps had the lowest proportion of enlisted men who were married at that time

(27 percent). By 1960, the marriage rate had increased to 48 percent for the military as a whole and 33 percent for the Marine Corps. [Ref. 6: p. 2-9]

With the advent of the All-Volunteer Force, marriage restrictions were dropped by all services. This occurred because the end of the draft brought pay raises to the enlisted ranks. This increased revenue helped to ease the burden of raising a family. An increasing focus on quality of life issues further helped to raise the military marriage rate. [Ref. 6: p. 2-10] Researchers Elwood and Ruth Carlson observe:

The reason for this rapid expansion of marriage . . . during a decade which saw a trend away from marriage among young adults in the general population, lay in the policies adopted to try and meet the recommendations of the Gates Commission. Even before the All-Volunteer era, all branches of the American Military have been moving in the direction of an increasing familistic manpower policy. Medical care, post exchanges, and housing for which families received priority, all were aimed in attracting and retaining an increasingly married population of young adults in the military. [Ref. 2: p. 86]

Today, there are no formal barriers preventing military personnel, officer or enlisted, from marrying with the exception of the regulation, discussed earlier in this chapter, prohibiting service academy students from being married or having dependents while attending the academies, and certain billets such as Marine Corps Security Guards. Regulations still exist, however, detailing the enlistment eligibility for potential applicants, but these vary among the services.

C. MARINE CORPS FAMILY LIFE

There is a close and interdependent relationship between marriage, family, community, and society, as detailed by sociologist Janice Rienarth:

As a societal institution, the family must accommodate its structures and functions as society changes. In the United States, two factors which have influenced the family, as well as other institutions, are urbanization and industrialization. Prior to

the 1930's, family life in America was primarily patriarchal, but by the 1940's the companionship marriage had emerged and the mobile, nuclear family became the norm. This norm was reciprocally reinforced by our increasing urbanization and industrialization. A fairly recent outgrowth of industrialization has been the egalitarian family characterized by shared responsibility. With men often absent from the home for a large part of the day, the woman has assumed greater responsibility. [Ref. 18: p. 30-31]

Stresses and strains exist between families and the Marine Corps as separate systems.

The Marine Corps seeks to make the family instrumental in its mission of developing and maintaining a highly-effective, combat-ready body of warriors, mobile enough to be deployed where needed. Within this goal, an attempt is made to ensure that Marine dependents are socialized to subordinate their personal desires and needs for the "good of the Corps," and to minimize claims on the time and presence of the spouse-parent. The Marine Corps wife/husband must understand that their spouse's duties will always come first in both their lives, before her/him, before their children, before relatives, personal desires, ambition, money or anything else. [Ref. 18: p.32] Many times, however, this is not the case, as Segal writes:

As institutions, both the military and family make great demands of the service member in terms of commitments, loyalty, time and energy. Due to various social trends in American society and in military family patterns, there is greater conflict now than in the past between these two "greedy" institutions. [Ref. 19: p. 9]

Rienerth adds:

General societal and specific military changes have resulted in periods of family disorganization and reorganization in order to insure the military family's continuation. Factors such as wartime mobilizations, extended separations, frequent residential changes and the idea of the "duty" have also affected the military family. Although these changes and factors may have weakened some of the distinctive characteristics of the military, it is still a unique style of life externally and internally. [Ref. 18: p. 35]

Regardless of how well dependents adjust to the military, the type of family that develops must necessarily adapt to the Marine Corps social structure. Persons who elect to have career military status must accept the risks of hardship and put their spouses and children in a secondary position. [Ref. 10]

The Marine Corps family can be described as a subculture. It is a part of both the Marine Corps institution and American society, and it has developed a unique style of life. The Marine Corps family, however, is like any other family in that it must fulfill certain personal as well as societal needs. It is not a static institution, for it experiences internal and external pressures that necessitate continual adjustment. As Rienerth observes:

The military institution in general has taken the cultural ideal of the nuclear family and reformed it to fit uniquely military specifications. [Ref. 18: p. 32]

Although slight differences in family life may exist among the various service branches, the general family foundation for all services is the same.

1. The Marine Corps Base

Military life is in many cases institutional. Traditionally, the military existed as an isolated community, sharply segregated from civilian society, with men and their families located on frontier outposts where they developed a distinctive way of living. The traditional military community molded families to the requirements of the profession. These bases were organized to provide the goods and services necessary for the maintenance of life. Today, changes in the nature of warfare and in the organization of the military have altered military living. It is still useful, however, to examine a military base as a type of "isolated"

community, a subculture, a place that not only provides goods and services, but also develops a "state of mind" or a common culture. [Ref. 3: p. 373-374]

Marine Corps bases, like those of the other services, are composed of two distinct but related types of organizations: the operational or FMF units, which are equipped for combat, and the garrison units, which keep the base functioning. While FMF units are highly mobile, garrison units usually do not deploy. The nature of military organizations is such that all basic services offered by civilian communities must be continuously available on the base, though this has been diminishing with the end of the Cold War and the resulting military downsizing. The need for base-provided services relates to the fact that many facilities are on call, personnel are continuously on the base, and there is a consistent transiency of Marine Corps units. [Ref. 3: p. 374-375]

Aside from the physical aspects of the base, there are social aspects that characterize the distinctive way of life in the Marine Corps. The intimate social solidarity found in the Marine Corps in the past was based on the peculiar occupational fact that separation between place of work and place of residence was absent. The spirit of the profession that invaded family and social life resulted in the development of a powerful esprit de corps and degree of social isolation. [Ref. 3: p. 378-379] The traditional picture presented above has since been altered, as Rienerth observes:

First, the civilian pattern of separating work and residence has become the norm. Primarily this is because a sufficient amount of the base housing is rarely available, but also there has been an increase in the number of married personnel in the military. Second, the number of people in the military has made a close primary group impossible. This population, which includes a large number of civilians, has increased the size of the military bases. These larger populations have contributed to the greater importance of secondary groups. Third, the backgrounds of military

people today are more heterogeneous than in the past. There are few traditional service families with a long history of military careers. The present-day officers and enlisted men come from a much broader social base. Fourth the social stratification of the military is becoming ambiguous, especially in the off-duty hours. The stratification system which once tended to increase the sense of solidarity has given way to the intermingling of groups. Fifth, the increasing similarity of military and professional jobs has made it impossible for many service personnel to see their profession as unique. This is primarily the result of the technological revolution. [Ref. 18: p. 34-35]

Life in the Marine Corps, as with the other services, has always been characterized by chronic uncertainty, including that of assignments, promotions, and evaluations. Although this uncertainty is common knowledge, it can produce internal strain on the member's family.

D. MISSION AND ROLE OF THE FLEET MARINE FORCE

The statutory mission of the Marine Corps is as follows:

To organize, train, and equip to provide fleet Marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign; provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy; provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases; and perform other duties as the President may direct. The Marine Corps is also responsible for developing amphibious doctrine including tactics, techniques and equipment used by landing forces. [Ref. 16: p. 79]

For more than 220 years, the Marine Corps has provided a substantial portion of the nation's combat power for a relatively low portion of the Department of Defense budget. [Ref. 11: p.16] The Marine Corps is comprised of three components: Headquarters, United States Marine Corps; Marine Corps Operating Forces; and Marine Corps Supporting Establishment. This study focuses on one component of the Marine Corps operating forces, the FMF. [Ref. 16: p. 82]

The FMF is the primary combat-related portion of the Marine Corps. It is broken down into two geographical commands, FMF Atlantic in Norfolk, Virginia and FMF Pacific at Camp H. M. Smith, Hawaii. The FMF is a balanced force of combined arms, comprising land, air, and service elements of the Marine Corps. The FMF is an integral part of a U.S. Fleet and has the status of a type command. It may consist of a headquarters, Force Service Support Group (FSSG), one or more Marine divisions, and one or more Marine aircraft wings. [Ref. 21: p. 2-1]

The mission of the FMF is described in *Fleet Marine Force Organization 1992* as follows:

To serve with the fleet in the seizure and defense of advanced naval bases and in the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. To develop, as directed by the Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC), those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, techniques, and equipment employed by amphibious troops. To train and equip Marine forces for airborne operations as directed by CMC. To train a maximum number of personnel to meet the requirements of expansion in time of war. To perform such other duties as may be directed. [Ref. 21: p. 1-1]

E. OFFICER SELECTION OF A MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTY (MOS)

All officers in the Marine Corps attend The Basic School (TBS) in Quantico, Virginia, where they receive basic instruction on being a Marine officer and where they earn their MOS. Officers who attend TBS are assigned to companies. Although the size of companies vary, they generally contain between 150 and 250 officers. Each company is commanded by a Major, assisted by a Captain as Executive Officer (XO) and several Staff Platoon Commanders (SPC) who are either senior First-Lieutenants or Captains.

The selection process that awards officers their MOS is known as the Quality Spread (QS). The QS awards officers an MOS based on two criteria, overall performance at TBS and the "wish list" of MOSs each officer submits to his seniors. The wish list includes an officer's preference for occupational assignment.

The QS is used to divide each company into thirds. Each officer is placed within a third that is determined by his or her MOS. Thus, a company with 210 Second-Lieutenants will be broken down into three, seventy-person groups. The company will be assigned a block of various MOSs by HQMC equal to the number of officers. The Company Commander, assisted by the XO and the SPCs, will then select each Lieutenant's MOS with the help of the wish lists, starting with the number one Lieutenant in the first-third, then moving to the number one person in the second-third, then to the top officer in the third-third, then to the number two Marine in the first-third, and so on until all Lieutenants have an MOS. Generally, the first person in each third gets his or her first choice of MOS while the last person in each third gets whatever is left. Most officers usually get one of the top three choices on their wish list, but it is not uncommon for Marines near the bottom of the thirds to get an MOS that did not appear on their wish list.

The QS is designed to distribute quality officers among some of the less glamorous and desirable MOSs. As would be expected, given the nature of the Marine Corps, combat arms positions are generally more popular choices than are the support MOSs. Consequently, a male Second-Lieutenant who wants "infantry," but finishes in the bottom of the second-third, could well end up with "supply," one of the less popular billets, as an MOS even if it is not on his wish list.

The officer MOS selection process and the QS suggest that combat arms officers and support officers have a fundamentally similar mind-set, formulated by the shared experience of TBS. During MOS training, instructors have precious little time to teach students the basics of their MOS, so there is little if any divergence from the planned course of study at most schools. If there are any differing views of the Marine Corps across MOSs, then, they are unlikely to have developed as a direct result of MOS training. Early training experiences tend to mold Marines, first and foremost, who are inculcated with the values of the organization as a whole.

F. COHESION

Cohesion, also known as elan, esprit de corps, and the "human element," is defined as "the bonding together of members of an organization/unit in such a way as to sustain their will and commitment to each other, their unit, and the mission." [Ref. 12: p. 4] In many battles and wars, cohesion has been the element that brought victory against overwhelming odds. Researchers need not look back far in history to discover proof of this. The past thirty years alone offer numerous examples. Vietnam, where the United States failed to consider the human element in war, is but one recent instance. It has been said that the U.S. placed too much emphasis on tangible factors, such as the number of troops in country, tonnage of ordnance fired/dropped, and the enemy body count. Categories that could be counted, classified, and analyzed became important at the expense of the human element, which was too difficult to quantify. [Ref. 12: p. XXIV-XXV] As Darryl Henderson states:

Such thinking led to the debacle in Vietnam. During Vietnam almost every factor was considered except the one that was to become the most important, the human element. Combined with allied contributions, U.S. forces overwhelmed the North

Vietnamese numerically in all traditional categories of military power. In opposition, the North Vietnamese fielded an army in the south that was inferior in every comparable way (logistical support, firepower, mobility). [Ref. 12: p. 1]

The North Vietnamese Army (NVA) and the Vietcong (VC) did not ignore the human element as Van Tien Dung, NVA Chief of Staff during the war, detailed:

Our arms and equipment were weaker than the enemy's thus we could only develop moral superiority (within the army) and only then have the courage to attack the enemy, only then dare to fight the enemy resolutely, only then could we stand solidly before all difficult trials created by the superior firepower that the enemy had brought into the war. [Ref. 12: p. 1]

In the face of overwhelming military power, North Vietnam had to rely on the human factor. This point is discussed by Henderson in his book, *Why the Vietcong Fought*:

The attention paid within that army to organization, leadership, care of the soldier, and development of military cohesion and psychological control within the smallest units has not been equaled by other modern armies. The North Vietnamese Army was able to endure some of the greatest stress of combat and hardship because of its extensive development of the human element. [Ref. 13: p. 119]

Though the level of unit cohesion exhibited by the NVA and the VC during the Vietnam War has yet to be matched, the human element in war is still prevalent in many other conflicts of recent times. For example, the human element was witnessed and documented in the Middle East during the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, in the Falklands/Malvinas War of 1982 between Argentina and the United Kingdom, and, most recently, in the Persian Gulf during Operation Desert Storm/Desert Shield.

But cohesion in a unit does not begin, grow, flourish, and die solely on the battlefield. Nor is it restricted to the confines of the military, as one commentator notes:

The view of cohesion as an isolated phenomenon on the battlefield indicates a narrow comprehension of the nature of military cohesion and its origins. [Ref. 8: p. XIX]

An organized sports team, for example, is another type of unit; and it experiences cohesion during its lifespan without ever entering combat. Cohesion begins when the team is first formed and the teammates begin bonding. The cohesive bonds grow during practice, and they strengthen and flourish through shared experiences, both hardship and victory, as the season continues.

What is true for sports teams also holds true for the Marine Corps. For example, all Marines, officers and enlisted, endure entry-level training designed to challenge and test the individual. For the officers, it is Officer Candidate School in Quantico, Virginia; and for enlisted Marines, it is Boot Camp at either Parris Island, South Carolina or San Diego, California. Regardless of MOS, rank, age, race, gender, or educational background, every Marine has a shared experience that ties him or her to all other Marines past, present, and future.

The cohesion of an FMF unit is similar to that described above, but generally much stronger. By far, cohesion is the strongest in the small units of the FMF; companies, platoons, sections, and squads tend to create closer bonds among Marines than do divisions, wings or regiments. Cohesion is also evident in the larger units, but as Henderson observes:

Cohesion in a military force must be sought where it occurs at the small unit level among the intimate face to face groups that emerge in peacetime as well as war... because it is possible to observe how small-group members respond as individuals within these organizations, and because leadership techniques and their impact on the small group are also visible at this level. [Ref. 12: p. 9]

In his book, *Cohesion, the Human Element in Combat*, Henderson details three categories that are vital to small unit cohesion. These are organizational characteristics,

small group and unit characteristics, and leadership. According to Henderson, the combination of these three elements is what forms unit cohesion:

In view of the general consensus of what a cohesive army is, any ordering of characteristics of such an army must consider the following areas: the overall organizational structure, which includes the party, army, or other sources of goals, policy, and support; the "human element" or the small intimate groups that control and motivate soldiers through their norms; and the influence of the leader on the small group and the commitment of the individual soldier toward achieving army goals. [Ref. 12: p. 9-10]

1. Organizational Characteristics

The primary function of the organization is to provide objectives or goals to the smaller units. This gives the small unit a purpose, a mission, a role. A second function of the organization is to provide the small unit with various types and degrees of support, including food, water, fuel, and other logistical support. The final function of the organization is to provide a structure to small units that will promote cohesion. This includes the organization of units, traditions, standardization, and cultural norms. The organization is the glue that unites all smaller entities within the structure and centers them around a common cause. [Ref. 12: p. 10-11]

2. Small Group and Unit Characteristics

The past two-hundred years have brought a great number of changes to warfare. As Henderson writes, "the form of warfare where soldiers marched lockstep into battle in long lines under the watchful eye of a sergeant behind them with drawn sword to slay would-be deserters, has changed to one of the small, independent-unit tactics and leadership found in recent wars." [Ref. 12: pg. XVIII]

The 1973 Arab-Israeli War is one of the best examples of this trend. The 1973 War, the largest tank battle ever fought, was characterized by numerous small unit engagements, most often won by the side displaying the most initiative, leadership, and cohesion at the small-unit level. [Ref. 14]

Research has shown that small, cohesive units display similar traits. First, they all have a clear role or task that defines their purpose, be it service support or combat arms. Second, the cohesive unit functions not just as a peer group but also as a "buddy group," capable of providing the basic needs, psychological and social, of the individual. Third, it is the dominant group that controls the day-to-day routine of the group member. Fourth, the cohesive unit provides a leader who works within the unit, ensuring that the group conforms to stated norms and operates according to the organization's objectives. Finally, the cohesive unit operates an observation and reporting system that it uses to police the behavior of individuals within the group. This self-correcting mechanism uses peer and leadership pressures to restore and maintain conformity. [Ref. 12: p. 11]

As detailed by Nora Stewart, a cohesive unit will meet the physical, security, and social needs of its members, provide adequate food, water, and medical support, be a major source of esteem and recognition, instill a strong feeling of affection and mutual admiration among members, and provide members with a source of influence over events in the unit. [Ref. 20: p. 27-42] But, as Henderson points out, if these needs are not met, the unit member will become dissatisfied and seek fulfillment outside the unit or even attempt to leave the unit altogether. [Ref. 12: p. 14]

3. Leadership Characteristics

In small, cohesive units, the primary mission of the leader is to convey the goals of the organization to the unit and to push it to achieve these goals. The leader is also responsible for maintaining group norms, controlling deviance, and creating a sound leadership philosophy that is shared within the unit. The philosophy should embrace ideals such as leadership (by example), fairness, moral courage, and other traits associated with the military professional. [Ref. 12: p. 111]

First, it is important for leaders to be perceived by the units they lead as being competent, proficient, and professional. When the leader possesses these three traits, the unit will be confident that he or she will be able to deal successfully with any situation that may arise, on or off the battlefield. Second, leaders in cohesive units prefer a "not afraid to get dirty" method that is face-to-face and personal with the troops. Third, leaders of cohesive units emphasize to their troops the fact that the work done by the unit is a team effort, and that any hardship and danger encountered will be shared equally by everyone. Further, leaders ensure that they are granted sufficient authority to control events within their units, such as the disciplining of deviants and giving awards. [Ref. 12: p. 114-115]

G. CONCLUSION

This chapter provides a brief review of the history of marriage in the military, Marine Corps family life, the FMF, officer MOS selection, and cohesion. The review lays a foundation for interpreting the results of the focused interviews and understanding their implications for the Marine Corps.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. DATA COLLECTION

This thesis uses information obtained through in-depth interviews to explore the relationship between marriage and cohesion in FMF units. The sample consists of twenty-five Marine officers, twenty-one men and four women, ranging in rank from First Lieutenant to Lieutenant Colonel. The sample of officers represented various MOSs, professional backgrounds, and levels of experience. Nineteen officers were married and six were single at the time of the interviews. Appendix A provides a breakdown of officers in the sample by their demographic characteristics. Appendix B provides information on the MOSs of the interviewees. The interviews were recorded on audio cassette. The responses from the interviews were transcribed verbatim for ease of analysis.

The researcher conducted all interviews at the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS), Monterey, California, from 20 August to 5 September 1996. The sample of officers consists of men and women with troop-leading experience in the FMF and are, therefore, considered knowledgeable of the subject matter discussed within this thesis.

Before beginning each interview, the researcher attempted to build a rapport with the interviewee by setting a tone of trust and confidentiality. The researcher also read a brief paragraph to each interviewee to provide necessary information on the scope of the thesis. Each interview was conducted in a private room to inspire casual conversation and candid responses to the questions. The interviewee was informed that the conversation was

recorded for the purpose of accuracy, and that no data traceable to the individual would be utilized.

All interviewees seemed to feel at ease and to openly convey their backgrounds, opinions, and experiences, both positive and negative. They appeared comfortable exchanging their stories with the researcher, who has a similar background and experiences as an officer in the FMF.

The interview questions were open-ended and provided ample freedom for the subjects to openly discuss any matter they wanted to address. Appendix C shows the questions that were asked of each interviewee. At times, the responses provided by the interviewee prompted the researcher to use probing questions to clarify the points being expressed.

It was not possible to include the perspectives of enlisted Marines in the study because of the locale where the interviews were conducted. Currently, there are no enlisted Marines stationed at NPS. Clearly, this limits the findings contained in the thesis. Another possible limitation relates to the fact that the officers who were interviewed are graduate students. These Marines may differ in some respect from other Marine officers who were not selected (or not choosing) to pursue higher education. As noted above, only twenty-five interviews were conducted with Marine officers. The intent was to interview a small group, to identify underlying themes or trends. The researcher sought to determine whether a Marine's MOS, time-in-grade (TIG), marital status, or gender exercised an influence on his or her perspective on marriage and unit cohesion. For this thesis, Marine MOSs were classified into two general categories, Combat Arms (to denote warfighting specialties such

as infantry, armor, and combat engineers) and Support (encompassing MOSs such as logistics, supply, and communications).

B. DATA ANALYSIS AND THEME DEVELOPMENT

The data were compiled on templates (see Appendix D), and the contents were analyzed to identify trends and recurring issues related to marriage and cohesion in the Marine Corps. Themes were then developed by analyzing the groupings of recurring issues or topics and determining the underlying points made by the interviewees. These themes are presented in Chapters IV and V along with supporting justification. Each justification is reinforced with quotations that exemplify the opinions of the Marine officers interviewed.

In addition to general trend analysis, the responses were examined in separate groupings. The first grouping compared the perspectives of single and married officers. No major differences were found based on marital status. It should be noted, however, that a relatively small number of single officers (six) were interviewed for this thesis. The vast majority of Marine officers who attend NPS are married.

The second grouping compared the responses of interviewees based on gender. As with marital status, no identifiable trend was found with respect to gender. Again, as with single officers, the vast majority of Marines enrolled in NPS are male. As a result, just four female officers were interviewed as part of the study.

A third approach analyzed the responses by rank and TIG. Once again, as with the other groupings, no significant trend could be developed.

The final comparison looked at the data by MOS. The twenty-five officers were divided across fourteen MOSs, which were further examined by two categories, "combat arms" and "support." When the responses were analyzed by occupation, clear divisions were found between combat arms officers and those assigned to support positions.

IV. RESULTS

A. OVERVIEW

Eleven prominent themes emerged from the data collected during the interviews. These themes represent the perceptions of the officers interviewed regarding marriage and its effect upon the cohesion of FMF units. Justifications for the themes are contained in Chapter V.

B. THEME I: THE TIME A UNIT SPENDS TOGETHER IS THE MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENT TO BUILDING A COHESIVE UNIT

Eleven of the officers interviewed felt that the most important element in building cohesion within a unit is the time that the unit spends together either engaged in day-to-day activities or on training exercises. Of these officers, nine stated that the time necessary to build cohesive bonds should be of good quality and challenging. While these officers stated that it was important for Marines to socialize off-duty, idle time was often seen as an impetus for Marines to form cliques and for problems to develop.

Seven of the officers stated that deployments overseas are the best events to build cohesive units. They further stated that the six-month work-up, which all units must undergo prior to deploying, is where cohesive bonds are supposed to develop; yet, this is often not the case. During the six-month work-up, Marines are still exposed to distractions that take them away from their duties. For married Marines, the distractions run the gamut from mundane family situations (e.g., financial setbacks, sick spouse/dependents) to more serious problems such as infidelity or divorce. Only when the Marine is physically removed from

the distraction (i.e., deployed overseas) is the unit able to build the cohesive bonds desired.

For single Marines, many of the distractions they face (e.g., fighting, alcohol-related incidents) stateside are still present during deployments overseas, but due to the isolation of some postings (e.g., aboard naval vessels) the occurrence is less frequent.

C. THEME II: BARRACKS ARE NOT CONDUCTIVE TO BUILDING COHESION IN UNITS

Nineteen interviewees felt that the barracks, in its present three-men to a room, hotel-style form, is not an important element in building unit cohesion. The previous design of barracks (open squad bays in which all single enlisted Marines, sergeant and below, were housed) was believed to be more effective in creating cohesion. Today, squad bays are found largely at training commands such as Marine Corps Recruit Depots. The officers interviewed believed that today's barracks, in many ways, actually hinder the development of cohesion due to overcrowding, the formation of cliques and gangs, and the elimination of unit areas within the new barracks.

Twelve of the officers noted that large numbers of Marines are moving out of the barracks, but the exodus is not limited to Marines getting married. Single Marines seeking a better quality of life have begun to move out of the barracks, normally without their Commanding Officer's permission or financial compensation from the Marine Corps, and into apartments located off base.

D. THEME III: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARRIED AND SINGLE MARINES IN FMF UNITS IS GOOD

All officers interviewed agreed that the day-to-day working relationship between single and married Marines within their units was generally good. Although animosity sometimes developed when single Marines felt married Marines were getting preferential treatment (e.g., no duty on holidays, time off to take care of family-related matters), these instances were relatively minor and never affected the functioning of a unit. Furthermore, whatever discord existed between married and single personnel, it never had any lasting impact upon the unit's cohesion, according to the officers interviewed.

E. THEME IV: MARITAL PROBLEMS CAN AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF MARRIED MARINES IN THE FMF

Eighteen of the twenty-five interviewees believed that marital problems can affect a married Marine's overall performance. Sixteen of the eighteen stated that single Marines with any type of problem may also suffer in terms of overall performance, since the primary focus is on their personal circumstances, not their duties. In this respect, then, single Marines are no different than their married counterparts. All interviewees stated that personnel problems requiring disciplinary action are far more common among single Marines than among those who are married. Single Marines tend to encounter problems, fights, alcohol-related incidents, and unauthorized absences more frequently than their married counterparts. When married Marines have serious marital problems (e.g., divorce, spousal abuse, infidelity), the seventeen of the interviewees believed they were more taxing on both the leader(s) and the unit than were the personal problems of single Marines.

F. THEME V: IN STRESSFUL SITUATIONS, MARRIED PERSONNEL PERFORM NO DIFFERENTLY THAN SINGLE PERSONNEL

Seven of the interviewees had been in stressful situations with their FMF unit. These officers were asked whether married personnel performed any differently than their single counterparts under difficult circumstances (e.g., combat operations, humanitarian missions, life threatening situations). All seven of the interviewees believed that marriage does not affect the performance of a Marine under stress. Indeed, they stated that married Marines typically focused their attention on the mission, especially in a combat environment, better than their single counterparts. This was primarily because many Marines felt they were fighting to protect their families and their way of life. While single Marines also have families (e.g., parents, siblings), they tend to think mainly of the welfare of their fellow Marines in such situations. Though married Marines also are concerned with their comrades' well-being, the fact that they have children and spouses at home keeps the Marine thinking "straight and level-headed" and brings a sense of calm to the unit.

G. THEME VI: SPOUSES CAN AFFECT THE UNIT

Most of the interviewees felt that spouses affect the unit in some way. However, opinions differed on the type or nature of the effect. Sixteen of the officers cited the Key-wives\Key-volunteers as a positive program that aids deployable units by indoctrinating spouses to the military lifestyle, providing a support group during stressful times, alleviating problems that the unit might otherwise have to solve (e.g., problems with base housing, administrative mistakes) while deployed, and serving as an information conduit between spouses and the unit. The negative ways in which spouses affected FMF units were seen as

financial (e.g., bouncing checks at the base exchange that would be reported to the unit), administrative (e.g., time needed to deal with wills and powers of attorney), and as a distraction (e.g., through serious marital problems such as divorce, infidelity, or spousal abuse that can take a Marine away from the unit).

H. THEME VII: THE INDOCTRINATION OF SPOUSES TO THE MARINE CORPS AND ITS WAY OF LIFE IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF A SUCCESSFUL MARINE CORPS MARRIAGE

Nine officers felt that it was important for the spouses of Marines to be indoctrinated to the functioning of the Marine Corps, as well as the customs and traditions associated with it, for the marriage to flourish. Though none stated that this reason alone was causing Marine marriages to fail, the interviewees did remark that a person not familiar with the functioning of the Marine Corps goes through "culture shock" when put into the environment. Long separations due to training or deployments, risk of harm to the Marine, isolation from family and friends, are all situations that Marine spouses must endure regularly. A spouse not familiar with the Marine Corps may find it difficult to deal with such situations, which may in turn lead to other marital problems that affect the married Marine's performance.

I. THEME VIII: FAMILIES ARE THE PRIMARY INFLUENCE ON A MARRIED MARINE'S BEHAVIOR, NOT THE MARINE CORPS

The family, not the Marine Corps, is the primary influence on a Marine's day-to-day behavior. All nineteen married interviewees generally agreed that married personnel often make decisions with the family in mind first and the Marine Corps second. This creates problems between the two institutions of the military and the family because both compete

for the Marine's time and attention. In instances where conflicts occur, the family usually comes out ahead. In instances where the Marine Corps takes precedence over the family--such as unit deployments, permanent changes of station, or mandatory unaccompanied tours--the relationship that exists between the spouse and the Marine Corps or the unit is often strained. Strained relations between a spouse and the unit can affect the Marine's performance and force the unit to allocate time and energy to right the relationship. The six single Marines interviewed stated that the Marine Corps is the primary influence on their behavior.

J. THEME IX: DEALING WITH MARRIED MARINES IS A LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE

Twenty-two of the officers interviewed stated that handling marital problems or married personnel in general in a unit was a challenge to leaders at all levels. It was generally felt that dealing with single Marines and their personal problems (e.g., getting into fights, driving under the influence, bouncing checks) is simpler than dealing with problems that are particular to married personnel. This is because the Marine is a member of the organization and is contractually bound to obey the Marine Corps' regulations and receive punishment for infractions. When a Marine is married, it is not that simple. For example, if the spouse of a Marine desires to cash checks at the Marine Corps Exchange (a military department store), he or she must record the spouse's unit and work number with the cashier. If the check bounces, then a notice is sent to the Marine's unit notifying the command of the infraction. While a Marine, either single or married, can be disciplined for bouncing checks, spouses cannot. The worst punishment is a cancellation of check-writing privileges by the

exchange. The unit has no direct control over the spouse, but must deal with the consequences of his or her actions. All Marine officers interviewed indicated that the Marine Corps provides no formal training in dealing with spouses and that neither the Marine Corps nor their units have adequate resources to deal with such problems.

K. THEME X: THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARRIAGE AND COHESION

Twenty-three of the interviewees claimed that a relationship exists between marriage and cohesion, but there were clear differences of opinion regarding the type of relationship, whether adverse or beneficial, and its effect on the functioning of the unit. It should be noted that, among the fourteen interviewees who saw the relationship between marriage and the cohesion of FMF units as adverse, none felt that the negative aspects of the relationship would prevent a unit from accomplishing its primary mission.

Those who viewed marriage as beneficial to unit cohesion generally considered it a "stabilizer" that helps Marines focus on their duties and foster responsibility in individuals. According to these interviewees, marriage assists units by preventing overcrowding in the barracks (married Marines do not live in the barracks) and by providing a "home-type" atmosphere to help relieve the loneliness that military personnel may experience during the holidays.

L. THEME XI: THE MAJORITY OF INTERVIEWEES DO NOT TRUST THE JUDGMENT OF JUNIOR MARINES WHEN IT COMES TO MARRIAGE

Twenty of the interviewees felt that when it comes to marriage, junior enlisted Marines generally make poor choices. The interviewees consistently expressed the view that

marriages by young Marines often lead to problems of one type or another. The consensus was that the typical first-term Marine lacked the maturity, judgment, and sense of responsibility needed to balance the demands of a new marriage with life in the Marine Corps. Throughout the course of the interviews, whenever the subject of marriage was brought up, the focus usually shifted to junior enlisted Marines.

V. ANALYSIS

A. OVERVIEW

The justifications for the themes presented in Chapter IV are presented here. Each justification is reinforced with quotations that exemplify the opinions of the Marine officers interviewed. The numbers that appear in parentheses (e.g., 03) are used to identify the interviewee and to locate the corresponding transcript and data sheets for the interview. These codes contain no identifying information on the individuals interviewed.

B. THEME I: THE TIME A UNIT SPENDS TOGETHER IS THE MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENT IN BUILDING A COHESIVE UNIT

Among the officers interviewed, eleven felt that the most important element in building cohesion within a unit is the time that the unit spends together, engaged in either day-to-day activities or training. Eight of these officers were combat arms officers. As one infantry Captain (03) stated:

Well, there are a lot of things important for a unit to build cohesion; but the most significant, in my view, is the time spent together, you know, that Marines train together, go to the field together, work together, basically share experiences, bond. That time they spend with each other just being Marines is how cohesion develops.

A Major (25) whose MOS is aviation supply concurred:

Time working together, sharing experiences is what's important to building cohesion.

Nine of the eleven officers also stated that the time must be of good quality, not merely idle time. All six of the Marines interviewed who had served as a company

commander were among the nine interviewees emphasizing quality time. As one Major (24) related:

Marines with more time on their hands are more likely to get in trouble. My MOS and the jobs in the unit I commanded are basically seven to four, and there is no field time involved, so my Marines have their evenings free and it's this time, free time, that often causes them to get into trouble.

Another Major (18) saw idle time as a more serious threat to unit cohesion:

It's better to be in the field or training or working. The Marines have to be doing something constructive. If they just sit around talking, or if the work gets too simple and repetitious, then they get bored. When this happens, Marines lose their interest in the Corps, there is no challenge. You've got to challenge Marines. If you don't, then the mind tends to wander and you lose'em. They turn into barracks lawyers, they're disillusioned and have a negative impact on the unit, especially when you get new joins.

Seven of the eleven officers also felt that cohesion seems to develop best on overseas deployments where Marines are isolated and free from distractions in the continental United States (CONUS). All officers who expressed this view were combat arms officers. The reasoning behind this could be that, while the tasks and day-to-day operations of support personnel (e.g., logistics, supply, communications) differ little whether or not they are located in CONUS or overseas, communicators will still repair and operate radios, logisticians will continue to meet the logistical needs of the unit, and supply Marines will ensure that the proper equipment and materials are ordered and distributed. But the operations and training of combat arms on a deployment can differ significantly from operations at a home base. A unit stationed in Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, where live-fire training is restricted, can find itself on the Korean Peninsula where few restrictions are imposed, as one Major (17) related:

Yeah, take for example training in Lejeune. The infantry guys have it fairly good but being in "tracks" makes it tough to train because not only do you have to fight other units for the limited number of ranges, but there's only so many places you can go driving in big green machines. Environmental things and stuff. But when I was a lieutenant, platoon commander, on the West Coast and we UDP'd to Okinawa, we found ourselves in Korea for several weeks. Now that was great! You could train there. The Koreans didn't give a damn what you did, where you drove, what you fired. And the troops loved it. We really got tight over there because we were able to train. No distractions. Be Marines. Yeah, Lejeune kinda kept us from doing that. You not only had to fight for ranges but the Marines were scattered, family problems or errands to run. That kinda kept you from being a Marine.

Several officers even stated they got to know their unit better during the deployment than during the six-month work-up that all units undergo prior to a routine deployment. The six-month work-up is traditionally the time during which cohesion is expected to strengthen in units. As one Major (21) expressed:

The best, I thought, is when the unit deployed someplace because everyone is the same. I was able to spend more time with my Marines deployed than I was back in the field or back in garrison, because I didn't have fifteen other competing demands of me. I slept with them out in the field, I stayed with them out in the field and we had great times. And I got to know them better on deployment than I did six months prior [when we were] working-up.

C. THEME II: BARRACKS ARE NOT CONDUCTIVE TO BUILDING COHESION IN UNITS

Nineteen of the interviewees felt that the barracks today, in their present arrangement of three men to a room, are no longer an important factor in building cohesion in units. As one Captain (08) stated:

The barracks? No, I don't think they're important anymore . . . well, at least not as important as they used to be. You know, like the old squad-bays. This new quality-of-life, two or three men in a room just doesn't work for building cohesion.

A Captain (20), and former enlisted Marine, had this to say when asked about the importance of the barracks in building cohesion in units:

When I first came in, the old squad bays were great. Yeah, you had a lack of privacy, but you were tight, you know? None of this Holiday Inn crap that the liberals forced on us. When it comes down to it, we're the ones who fight and know what's best for the Corps. If you want a strong unit that's tight, you need to bring back the squad bays. This new stuff just don't cut it. That's my view on the barracks today, anyway.

Another Captain (09) contrasted his experience deployed overseas with his troops living in a Quonset hut (i.e., an open-squad bay) and life in CONUS, where Marines were scattered, living either in the barracks or, if married, with their families. The Captain, a married infantry officer, goes on to relate that barracks life is unfair to single Marines:

I've got two experiences on this. I've got an experience of down in the Phillippines deployed where all my guys were in a Quonset hut and I think that cohesive-wise that's the best unit. A biased opinion of course. You know, that's where I had the most fun and I'd say a majority of my Marines had a lot of fun. And then you come back stateside, and I think that there's a lot of distractions, you know, some of the married guys aren't there, and I think there is a perception, and I suspected it's founded that married guys get preferential treatment. Like I said on the Saturdays, you know, who am I gonna call? Well, you know, I can just go up to the barracks and grab a couple guys or . . . call Gunny or . . . staff sergeant and task "I need such and such." But where is Gunny gonna go? He's gonna go to the barracks and grab a couple of young Marines.

One Major (21) identified the design and layout of the barracks as the primary reason why they have become ineffective as a cohesion-building element:

I think the barracks are important . . . let me rephrase that . . . were important to building cohesion. I think the style of the barracks, how they're laid out, has a lot to do with unit cohesiveness. At least they used to. When I got off, float [deployment] with 1/8 [1st Battalion, Eighth Marine Regiment], we didn't have the luxury of being able to put our troops in the same areas. I didn't have a block of rooms for my troops in one area or on one floor. We had to send sergeants out in town on BAQ [Basic Allowance for Quarters]. Troops were placed on different floors. We didn't have an area for the company that, you know, you could say "this is mine, stay away." That's what's wrong with the barracks today.

A Captain (19) with company command experience in the FSSG painted a very bleak picture of the barracks:

The barracks is just a breeding ground for trouble. It was like single Marines that lived in the barracks were always getting into trouble, either D.U.I.'s or gang-related activities or violence out in town, UA [unauthorized absence]. Most of the problems that I encountered were all with my single Marines living in the barracks. It was my young married Marines who had more stability.

Twelve of the officers felt that troops are moving out of the barracks in increasing numbers, but not because Marines are getting married. According to one Captain (07), single Marines are moving out due to what they perceive as a poor quality of life:

No, the troops moving out of the barracks today aren't just Marines that are getting married. In my last unit, there were a lot of Marines just fed up with the living conditions in the barracks, so they move out. They don't get anyone's permission, and rarely do they ask for money. They just move out and get a place in town. Yeah, they do keep their wall lockers and maintain a rack, but if the platoon commander or platoon sergeant or the Gunny needs to find that Marine or any Marine for a working party or something, they aren't there. The minute the day's over, they head for their apartment out in town. I've counseled these Marines, and I tell them: "Hey, you can buy a car for the money you pay to rent that place." But they don't listen, and we can't stop them from doing it.

One Major (21) even blamed the Marine Corps for the exodus of troops from the barracks along with the lack of funds to build new barracks:

As far as the migration, yes it's happening. And it's happening for cost reasons. It's being driven down our throats. An example is the whole master plan at Camp Lejeune. They are not going to build new barracks. They are sending Sergeants out in town, BAQ on-right. They are DEMOLISHING the number of barracks. The physical number of spaces every battalion gets is growing less, so it's gonna force people out in town whether or not they're married. That's happening.

D. THEME III: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARRIED AND SINGLE MARINES IN FMF UNITS IS GOOD

All officers interviewed agreed that the relationship between married and single Marines is good, and that, while animosity may sometimes arise, it is not long-lasting. As an infantry Captain (09) commented:

It would be a temporary, a temporary split maybe, that the Marine would be pulled away from the cohesive unit, disrupting the cohesiveness of the unit for a bit. But, again, [he] would either be reeled back in or sent home for a time being, and duties taken up by somebody else. And, normally, I don't think there is a whole lot of animosity from this among the Marines. If there is, it doesn't last long.

Another Captain (03) stated that all Marines, married and single, have a common bond that binds them together and marriage is never really an issue:

In all my units, I never experienced problems with troops because they were married or single. They were all Marines, and that's how they saw it. Yeah, problems developed sometimes between Marines, but it was never because a Marine was married.

One Captain (19) echoed this sentiment, stating that Marines always have something that unites them and permits them to function as a unit and work together:

I would say there is no difference in the way that the Marines who worked for me related to one another. Whether they were single or married, they all had something in common. Whether it was their interests or the virtue of their rank, marriage didn't impact their relationship in the workplace.

E. THEME IV: MARITAL PROBLEMS CAN AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF MARRIED MARINES IN THE FMF

Eighteen of the officers said that marital problems can adversely affect a Marine's performance. As one Captain (20) succinctly stated:

When a Marine's got trouble at home, his mind is not on his work.

Another Captain (05) saw married Marines, specifically those who were young and enlisted, more distracted from their work than single Marines:

It's clear to me that a Marine's performance is tied to his personal life, and being married adds many more variables which can affect a Marine's performance, generally for the worst. Marines today, young Lance Corporal-types and below, don't marry well most of the time. Whether it's lust or more money or loneliness, they don't think about the impact that marriage will have on their lives. They just get married. The young Marines, as I'm sure you're aware of, are where all the problems arise concerning marriage. And when the problems start, they just can't

cope and they don't concentrate on their work, and they want time off to handle the problem, and they don't want to go on deployment. At least, when a Marine gets a D.U.I., most of the time he's back at work, misses very little time, and still deploys.

Sixteen of the eighteen officers who saw marital problems as a drain upon a Marine's performance admitted that *any* Marine who has a personal problem will concentrate more upon the problem and less upon the job. As one Captain (07), just recently married, related:

Yeah, a problem is a problem whether you're single or married. If you're in a bad relationship or something goes wrong, like you get in trouble or something, you bet it's going to affect your performance regardless of marital status.

Another Captain (19) observed that her *single* Marines, and the problems they found themselves in, took up much more of her time than the problems associated with her married subordinates:

I had way more problems with my single Marines. And single Marine's problems would take up way more of my time than the problems my married Marines had, by far.

F. THEME V: IN STRESSFUL SITUATIONS, MARRIED PERSONNEL PERFORM NO DIFFERENTLY THAN SINGLE PERSONNEL

Only officers who had experience in stressful situations (e.g., combat operations or humanitarian missions) were asked this question. As it turned out, seven of the interviewees were qualified to address the question, with experiences in Panama, Operation Desert Shield\Desert Storm, Somalia, Haiti, and Guantanamo Bay. The seven officers tended to agree with the observation that married personnel have the greatest stake in fighting (i.e., to "protect" their spouses and children) and tend to focus more on the job at hand than do their single counterparts. [see, Ref. 9, for comparison] As one Captain (14) related:

No, absolutely not. In situations like this, where a man faces death or injury, I don't think married Marines perform any differently from single Marines. In my case, being married with children, when I went to the Gulf, I actually focused solely on my duty, because, in my mind, I was protecting them from harm. I saw a lot of my married Marines do the same. They were generally less rash and impatient than the single Marines.

A Major (23), when asked how married Marines performed in stressful situations, expressed the following:

No, in stressful situations married Marines don't perform any differently than single ones. In my opinion, my married people worked harder and were more responsible in situations like this.

One Captain (20) said:

The thought of every Marine not living up his potential in a combat environment, well, it just never crossed my mind. Now, I got experience on both sides of the street, you know, enlisted and officer. And I'll tell you I never saw married Marines doing anything but their job when it got hot. I've found there comes a time when the training just takes over. You think you forgot something and, boom, when the time comes to use it, it's there. Even if you've got doubts about some Marines, when they get into a situation where the rubber meets the road, the training takes over and they do their job. Even Marines who hated each other before this suddenly are best buddies watching each other's back.

G. THEME VI: SPOUSES CAN AFFECT THE UNIT

A majority of the interviewees felt that spouses influence the unit in some way.

Sixteen of the officers cited the Key-wives\Key-volunteers program as a positive influence by spouses on FMF units. As one Captain (07) stated:

Though you really only see them right before you deploy, the Key-wives are there. I mean, they sometimes take the form of a phone tree, but they're out there solving problems which you might otherwise have to deal with. Especially when you go overseas, whether it be UDP [Unit Deployment Program], float, what have you, the Key-wives deal much more effectively with problems than you could from 6,000 miles away. Often, we would get a letter or call about a Marine's problem, and by the time we get a hold of someone back home, the Key-wives have already handled it, which saves us time.

Another Captain contrasted two of his units, one with a Key-wives organization and one without. He noted that there was a considerable difference in the way the units operated:

My last unit had a strong Key-wives organization. It was headed by the Battalion Commander's wife. They had a monthly newsletter and the C.O. and all his Company Commanders and the S-3 took an active part in it. And, yeah, it paid dividends because the wives were informed and they didn't bother the unit because that's what's important to them: being informed. Knowing what's going on. Unfortunately, the unit I had before didn't have a Key-wives program, they didn't really start till the Gulf, but we did have an officers' wives group but nothing [no support organization] for the enlisted wives. And we had a lot of problems. Wives always calling the unit complaining or asking questions. That took a lot of time.

But, spouses also affected the units in negative ways, as one Major (24) related:

To me, the worst way spouses affect a unit is by creating problems which take their spouse away from the unit. When this happens, some other Marine has to step forward and do that Marine's job. I think it's a testament to Marines because they step up and do the work. No complaints. But things get done slower, and going back to cohesion, the unit can't formulate those relationships to make the organization, the platoons and companies, strong or as strong as it should be.

Still another Captain (11) observed:

You always see the worst in the wives come out when the work-up starts. They just can't seem to grasp the fact that their husband has to train because, if he goes overseas and something happens where we go to fight and he doesn't know what's going on, he might die. But no, they want their husband to spend more time with them because he's going to be gone for six months. So, when the work-up comes around, all the problems start and...the Marine has to go deal with them. That's why I think the work-ups are a joke.

H. THEME VII: THE INDOCTRINATION OF SPOUSES TO THE MARINE CORPS AND ITS WAY OF LIFE IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF A SUCCESSFUL MARINE CORPS MARRIAGE

Nine of the officers felt it was important that spouses be indoctrinated in the "Marine Corps way of life" for a marriage to succeed, as one Major (18) related:

I think the thing that really helped my marriage when I was enlisted way back when . . . that was a long time ago. Yeah, back in the seventies, seventy-six actually. Brand new Private with wife in hand. Yeah, my first platoon sergeant was thrilled. But we knew how to live back then, though, not like today. We lived within our

means. It was tough, but it goes back to the point I was trying to make. The thing that helped my marriage succeed was that my wife knew about the military. Her father was Army, and mine was Navy, so she knew how everything worked, and she could turn to her mother or my mother for advice, and that helped. The Marine Corps held no big surprises for her. She was used to it. The moves, the separations, she knew what to expect.

Another Captain expressed the following:

I can't say that indoctrinating the wife is the most important thing to a marriage. No, I can't say that, but it has its place. I haven't seen marriages end solely because the wife wasn't indoctrinated, but I did see it lead to complications that caused marriages to end. You know, like you have a Marine on deployment, which his eighteen-year-old wife didn't expect when they got married. So she's lonely and goes out to find something to cure the loneliness, like another man.

I. THEME VIII: FAMILIES ARE THE PRIMARY INFLUENCE ON A MARRIED MARINE'S BEHAVIOR, NOT THE MARINE CORPS

It was clear that, among interviewees who were married, the family takes precedence over the Marine Corps. In contrast, single interviewees indicated that the Marine Corps is the primary influence upon their behavior. As one Captain (14) reflected:

The family is the first priority or, as I like to say, "the family is forever." I mean, I'm in the military, as is my wife. If I have to make a decision between my family and the Corps, the Corps is going to lose every time.

One Major (13) who was married related his experiences on the matter:

It has a drastic effect. Life at home determines life on the job. You try to develop a healthy mix between your wife, your family, and the Marine Corps, but conflicts arise. I'd be lying to say they didn't. But a lot of Marines don't see it this way. The Marine Corps doesn't, as you said, determine their behavior. It's the wife, the family, and I speak from personnel experience. My wife is always complaining: "Why did you have to volunteer? Couldn't someone else do it?" Or "Why do you have to work so late?" It's always something. You try to explain but that doesn't make it all right. In ten years I've seen a lot of good Marines get out because they don't think the Marine Corps life is good for the family.

Single Marines interviewed told a different story, as one junior Captain (04) related:

My only concern is what the Marine Corps tells me to do. That's the benefit of being single as far as I'm concerned. Now, my married troops, and even other

officers I've known who are married, they're more worried about their families but single Marines do what the Marine Corps tells us.

J. THEME IX: DEALING WITH MARRIED MARINES IS A LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE

Twenty-two of the officers indicated that attending to the problems of married Marines is often quite complicated because of spouses. As one Captain (16) observed:

Wow, I can't begin to tell you how many times I've had a wife calling me up yelling, "Where's the check?" Or "Why's my husband working so late?" Or "Why can't my husband take leave?" And I'm the Company Commander. No matter how much you yell at the troop, or hopefully the first sergeant does, they still call. They're not a Marine [the spouses] so you can't tell them to stop; and if you punish the Marine for the stupid things his wife does, well you just gave the woman more reason to call you up. And all you can do is be polite. Man, they just make things tough.

Unfortunately, Marine leaders do not get much in the way of training when it comes to dealing with spouses, which they feel adds to the challenge of leading married Marines.

As a Captain (02) related:

We don't get training for dealing with these types of problems. So, yeah, it is a challenge. I mean, they touch on it briefly as sort of an afterthought at TBS, but that's it. Sort of a hip-pocket class.

But, where some officers encountered problems in dealing with married Marines, others found unexpected tools to aid them, as another Captain (10) indicated:

I don't think I could've handled the problems I faced if it wasn't for the fact that I'm married. That fact alone helped me relate to my Marines who were married, and they respected that. And I like to think they listened to me most of the time, but I don't think they would've if I wasn't married. I mean, I knew what they were going through when dealing with these problems, because stuff like this happened to me and they knew that. They knew that, "Hey, she's married. She knows what she's talking about." More than somebody who's single.

Other officers stated that, while they personally didn't receive training to deal with married Marines, their spouses, and the situations they encounter, they did receive

instruction, someplace in their training, telling them where to turn should such problems arise. As one Captain (01) said:

Thank God for the Chaplain . . . I mean, I didn't know what to do with stuff like this. I remember the first time one of my guy's had a problem with his wife. I'd been there only about a couple of days. This Lance Corporal was married to a real gem. She was a former bar-girl he met in the Phillippines and was running around on him. So, he went to his squad leader, who brought it to the section chief, who brought it to me. Now, my first thought was to say: "Dump her!" But I remembered what my SPC at TBS told me: "If a Marine has a marital problem, send him to the Chaplain." So the Gunny took him to see the First Sergeant who made an appointment with the Chaplain. The story didn't end happily. The Marine got divorced, lost custody of his kid, most of his money [went] to child support and alimony, but the Chaplain did a lot better job of handling the sit [situation] than I would've.

Another Captain (09) echoed this by stating that, while he himself was not trained to handle these problems, there was a support structure that he could refer Marines to for help:

I think we are supposed to identify the problem and get them to appropriate sources, i.e., the Chaplain, i.e., . . . get them to psychiatric help, but that would normally run through the Chaplain. I would not make a decision such as that, but I would say: "Hey, listen, you need to get outside help." You know, so in that, that essence you still have to take time away to listen to that Marine's problems.

This same Captain, when asked whether he thought the Marine Corps should prohibit marriage among some personnel, to ease the workload of leaders forced to deal with such situations, expressed the following:

By doing that [prohibiting marriage to certain personnel] now, we are looking for a way to escape the leadership challenge of leading young Marines that are married. In my personal opinion, we're looking for an easy way to solve a very difficult leadership problem. And that would certainly do it; however, you would have complications [to deal with].

K. THEME X: THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARRIAGE AND COHESION

Twenty-three of the interviewees believed that a relationship between marriage and cohesion existed; but, responses varied on the type of relationship, from adverse to beneficial, and its apparent effect on the unit or accomplishment of the mission. Nine officers can be identified as viewing marriage and its relationship with unit cohesion as positive. At the same time, fourteen interviewees viewed the relationship in a mostly negative way. None of these fourteen officers, however, saw the relationship as preventing them from accomplishing the mission. At worst, in their view, it was a "nuisance." No clear division of opinions was found between single and married officers. A majority of the officers interviewed are married, and nine of them saw negative aspects in the relationship. Of single officers, two saw the relationship in a positive light, while four saw it as negative. Combat arms officers, on the other hand, generally saw negative aspects in the relationship between marriage and cohesion. As one infantry Major (21) stated:

Does marriage have an effect upon cohesion? Yes, it does. If you don't spend this much time with these people, you don't get to know them as well. You spend more time with them by being in the field. If you're going to let married personnel have a break and go home at night, they are not going to bond, they are going to have their own little group here and there.

One Captain (02) thought there was a mixture of both positive and negative effects-- and blamed junior enlisted Marines for most of what was seen as adverse:

I see marriage as slightly adverse. I mean, there is some positive but more negative, especially when you look at lance corporals and PFCs. You just have to spend a lot more time at all levels [like] platoon sergeant, squad leader to handle this. They just don't think when they get married. You heard the stories, you've experienced it. The horror stories are true. I don't have the problems with staff NCOs and NCOs that I do with the troops. It'd be better if we could keep them from getting

married. It won't happen, but it would be better. No, I don't think it would ever keep us from accomplishing the mission, but it sure as hell is a nuisance.

Another Captain (08) observed:

Marriage hurts the cohesion of a unit. It takes the Marines away from the workplace to deal with family-related issues a lot more often than single Marines. No, it doesn't stop us from doing our mission, we always find a way to do that, but when it comes to "who will be there to do the job?," you don't know.

One Captain (19) saw marriage as having a positive effect upon the cohesion of her previous unit:

I think marriage has a positive effect on cohesion. I attribute my success to the Marines who I worked with, many who were married. I think marriage, if anything, is a stabilizer, like I said earlier. My single Marines were just too immature and got into too much trouble for the most part. If anything, marriage brought us closer. I mean, it gave me the opportunity to know my Marines, their wives, their husbands, children. I had a lot of Marines that their families would come in daily because they only had one car. So, to me, it was great. I mean, I felt like I knew my Marines better because I knew their families."

L. THEME XI: THE MAJORITY OF INTERVIEWEES DO NOT TRUST THE JUDGMENT OF JUNIOR MARINES WHEN IT COMES TO MARRIAGE

Twenty of the officers interviewed stated that junior enlisted Marines, as a group, generally rush into marriage without thinking about the responsibility and implications of their action. These officers believed that junior enlisted personnel simply do not think things through before marrying. As one Captain (15) explained:

You know when I tell people, civilians, some of the stories [concerning married Marines] they call me a liar. The stories simply seem too unbelievable. But they're true and that's the sad thing about it. Whether it's lust or greed or loneliness, Marines don't think about the implications that marriage entails, and the result is they get burned and we, as leaders, have to deal with it.

Another Captain (03) echoed this sentiment:

They [junior enlisted Marines] generally have no idea what they're doing. A Marine may think that he's getting some extra money and privacy by getting out of the barracks. Yeah, ok, so a Marine, he may get a hundred dollars more a month, but now he's got a wife so he has to pay for her, too. But rarely do they think about that.

In this chapter, eleven themes are developed that encompass the feelings and perceptions of a small sample of Marine officers with respect to marriage and its effect upon cohesion. This thesis set out to define the connection between marriage and unit cohesion, examine the nature of the relationship, and determine areas where improvement or further study may be required. The next chapter considers the common perceptions among the Marine officers interviewed, draws conclusions, and offers recommendations.

VI. CONCLUSION

A. CONCLUSIONS

The themes developed in Chapters IV and V provide insight into the attitudes that a small group of Marine officers have toward marriage and its effect upon unit cohesion. The primary objective of this thesis was to explore whether or not that relationship exists within units of the FMF, and to determine what form the relationship takes. It was the perception of 90 percent of the Marines interviewed that marriage has an effect upon unit cohesion. There was less consensus concerning the nature of this effect. Nevertheless, about 56 percent of the interviewees felt that marriage is negatively related to unit cohesion.

Finally, when the responses of the interviewees were analyzed by MOS, clear divisions were found between combat arms officers and those assigned to support positions. The reason for this division between these two groupings is unknown, however, and may be an area worthy of further study.

B. POTENTIAL AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The information collected in this thesis provides some indication of the nature of the relationship between marriage and cohesion in Marine Corps FMF units. Follow-up research could focus on a sample that represents Marine Corps enlisted personnel and officers by gender, racial/ethnic group, MOS, TIG, and other relevant characteristics or conditions of service.

1. The Marine Corps Must Make Marriage More Culturally Acceptable

As previously noted, twenty-three of the twenty-five interviewees felt that a relationship exists between marriage and the cohesion of FMF units. Nine officers viewed the relationship as positive, while fourteen viewed at least some of the aspects of the relationship as negative. But, of the fourteen, none felt that the negative aspects would ever prevent them from accomplishing their mission. The perceived problems were merely a hindrance, or a "nuisance," as one interviewee termed it.

Previous research by Bruggemann concluded that the Marine Corps must undergo a cultural shift to create a friendlier environment for marriage. As Bruggemann stated:

The perceptions that married Marines are "an anchor around the neck" of the Marine Corps can not be tolerated any longer. This perception is a destructive distraction for the individual Marine and the Corps. It degrades unit cohesion and esprit de corps with the implication that there are two classes of Marine, married and single. A program must be implemented that reinforces the fact that every Marine is capable and prepared to fight and win in combat. [Ref. 1: pg. 44-45]

The Marine Corps must review its policies regarding quality of life issues that face married Marines. Marriage is a part of Marine Corps life; and American society, DoD, and the current political administration have let it be known that this is the way it shall be. If the Marine Corps' motto, Semper Fidelis, Always Faithful, means anything, there should be no question among Marine Corps leaders that this is the proper course. Even if further research is not conducted on the topic addressed in this thesis, enough awareness has been raised in recent years on this issue to push the Corps' decision makers in the right direction. Whatever future policies are pursued, they should not be made in a vacuum like ALMAR 266/93. Such

decisions should be made in consultation with the other services and with DoD to ensure that policies related to social issues are carefully coordinated and fully endorsed.

2. Marines of All Ranks, Whether Single or Married, Need to Undergo Marriage-Related Training

The change to more fully integrate marriage, families, and dependents into the Marine Corps way of life must also be coordinated and supported internally as well. A policy unpopular with Marines and their families is a policy that is doomed to fail. The Marine Corps must also be careful not to create policies or change that would alienate single Marines who may perceive injustice or favoritism. The Marine Corps must strive to better educate families concerning the workings of the Marine Corps and the hardships that members and their dependents must sometime endure. Special attention should also be directed at educating young, single Marines about married life and the responsibilities involved in balancing the demands of one's career and family. Leaders at all levels should undergo training to deal with marital problems. The training should not turn Marine officers, SNCOs, and NCOs into marriage counselors, but, rather, seek to make leaders aware of marriage-unique problems and the support network that exists within the Marine Corps (e.g., the Chaplain, family services center). This training would help leaders better manage their time and aid them in dealing with problems they may not be currently equipped to handle. This training would need to exist at all levels. For officers, it would be at TBS. Enlisted leaders could receive their initial instruction at the NCO Academy and would get follow-up training at each subsequent level of schooling (e.g., SNCO Academy, Advanced SNCO

Academy). These steps would undoubtedly build a stronger Marine Corps, prepared in all ways to meet the challenges of the future.

APPENDIX A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

| SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS | NUMBER |
|--------------------------|--------|
| GENDER | |
| Male | 21 |
| Female | 4 |
| RANK | |
| LtCol | 1 |
| Maj | 7 |
| Capt | 16 |
| 1stLt | 1 |
| MARITAL STATUS | |
| Married | 19 |
| Single | 6 |
| MOS DISTRIBUTION | |
| Combat Arms | 15 |
| Support | 10 |

**APPENDIX B. DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY MILITARY
OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTY (MOS)**

| MOS | NUMBER |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Adjutant (0180) | 1 |
| Air Defense Controller (7210) | 1 |
| Air Supply (6602) | 3 |
| Assault Amphibian (1803) | 1 |
| Combat Engineer (1302) | 2 |
| Communications (2502) | 2 |
| Data Systems (4002) | 1 |
| Financial Management (3404) | 1 |
| Ground Supply (3002) | 1 |
| Infantry (0302) | 6 |
| Logistics (0402) | 3 |
| Tanks (1802) | 1 |
| Pilot, Helicopter Medium-Lift (7562) | 1 |
| Motor Transport (3502) | 1 |

APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is your marital status?
2. What effect, if any, has the Marine Corps lifestyle had upon your choice of marital status?
3. Do you feel that the Marine Corps discourages or encourages marriage in any way? Explain.
4. In your view does the institution of marriage have an impact or not on the day-to-day operations of Fleet Marine Force units? On training? On deployments? Explain.
5. What was the relationship between single and married Marines in your unit(s)?
6. Is operational readiness of a unit affected by the marital status of its Marines? Explain.
7. Do spouses impact the operations of Fleet Marine Force units or not? If yes, how so?
8. What are your views on the barracks as a cohesion building element?
9. Do Fleet Marine Force units provide the social and support organizations necessary to meet a Marine's needs?
10. Do married Marines perform differently under stress than their single counterparts?

APPENDIX D. INTERVIEW TEMPLATE

RANK:

MOS:

TIG:

FMF TOUR(S):

MARITAL STATUS:

1. WHAT EFFECT, IF ANY, HAS THE MARINE CORPS LIFESTYLE HAD UPON YOUR CHOICE OF MARITAL STATUS?
2. DO YOU FEEL THAT THE MARINE CORPS DISCOURAGES OR ENCOURAGES MARRIAGE IN ANY WAY?
3. IN YOUR VIEW DOES THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE HAVE AN IMPACT OR NOT ON THE DAT-TO-DAY OPERATIONS, TRAINING, AND DEPLOYMENTS OF FLEET MARINE FORCE (FMF) UNITS?
4. WHAT WAS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SINGLE AND MARRIED MARINES IN YOUR UNIT(S)?
5. DO SPOUSES IMPACT OPERATIONAL READINESS?
6. DOES MARRIAGE AFFECT ESPRIT DE CORPS?
7. DO FMF UNITS PROVIDE THE SOCIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT TO SATISFY THE MARINE'S MAJOR NEEDS?
8. WHAT IS YOUR PERSONAL VIEW ON MARRIAGE IN THE MARINE CORPS?
9. DO YOU FEEL THAT MARRIAGE AFFECTS THE PERFORMANCE OF MARINES--EITHER POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY--IN ANY WAY?
10. AS A LEADER WHAT PROBLEMS DID YOU FACE WHEN DEALING WITH MARRIED PERSONNEL?
11. WHAT IMPACT DID MARRIAGE HAVE UPON THE COHESION OF SMALL UNITS?
12. DO BARRACKS PROMOTE COHESION?
13. DO YOU FEEL WE SHOULD PROHIBIT 1ST-TERMERS FROM MARRYING?

14. IF WE PROHIBIT 1ST TERM ENLISTEES FROM MARRYING SHOULD WE DO THE SAME WITH JUNIOR OFFICERS?

15. HOW WERE SPOUSES INVOLVED IN YOUR UNIT(S)?

16. DID PROBLEMS OF MARRIED PERSONNEL DIFFER FROM THOSE OF SINGLE PERSONNEL IN FREQUENCY AND MAGNITUDE?

17. DID SPOUSAL INVOLVEMENT HAVE AN EFFECT ON UNIT FUNCTIONING?

18. IN WHAT WAYS DOES MARRIAGE EFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF A MARRIED MARINE?

APPENDIX E. THEMES DEVELOPED FROM INTERVIEWS

- THEME I: THE TIME A UNIT SPENDS TOGETHER IS THE MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENT TO BUILDING A COHESIVE UNIT
- THEME II: BARRACKS ARE NOT CONDUCTIVE TO BUILDING COHESION IN UNITS
- THEME III: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARRIED AND SINGLE MARINES IN FMF UNITS IS GOOD
- THEME IV: MARITAL PROBLEMS CAN AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF MARRIED MARINES IN THE FMF
- THEME V: IN STRESSFUL SITUATIONS MARRIED PERSONNEL PERFORM NO DIFFERENTLY THAN SINGLE PERSONNEL
- THEME VI: SPOUSES CAN AFFECT THE UNIT
- THEME VII: THE INDOCTRINATION OF SPOUSES TO THE MARINE CORPS AND ITS WAY OF LIFE IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF A SUCCESSFUL MARINE CORPS MARRIAGE
- THEME VIII: FAMILIES ARE THE PRIMARY INFLUENCE ON A MARRIED MARINE'S BEHAVIOR, NOT THE MARINE CORPS
- THEME IX: DEALING WITH MARRIED MARINES IS A LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE
- THEME X: THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARRIAGE AND COHESION
- THEME XI: THE MAJORITY OF INTERVIEWEES DO NOT TRUST THE JUDGMENT OF JUNIOR ENLISTED MARINES WHEN IT COMES TO MARRIAGE

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Bruggemann, Robert, Tell it to the Marines: Marriage and the First-Term Force, United States Marine Corps Command and Staff College, 1996.
2. Carlson, Elwood and Ruth, Navy Marriages and Deployment, University Press of America, 1984.
3. Coates, C. H. and R. J. Pellergrin, Military Sociology: A study of American Military Institutions and Military Life, The Maryland Book Exchange, College Park, Maryland, 1965.
4. Coffman, Edward M., The Old Army, Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 1986.
5. Congressional Budget Office, An Update: The Economic and Budget Outlook, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1995.
6. Department of Defense Family Status and Initial Term of Service, Volumes II & III, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., December 1993.
7. Fey, T. R., "The Nondeployable Marine Corps: Observations of a Company Grade Officer," Marine Corps Gazette, January 1996.
8. "Fifty Years of Military Life," Army Times, p. 61, September 1990.
9. Goldman, Nancy L. and David R. Segal, The Social Psychology of Military Service, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California, 1976.
10. Gomulka, E. T., "Marriage and the Military Life," Marines, September 1993.
11. Gross-Harvey, Stephanie, et. al, United States Naval Academy Catalog 1992/1993, United States Naval Academy Public Affairs Office, Annapolis, Maryland, 1992.
12. Henderson, William D., Cohesion, the Human Element in Combat, National Defense University Press, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C., 1985.
13. Henderson, William D., Why the Vietcong Fought: A Study of Motivation and Control in a Modern Army in Combat, Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn., 1979.
14. Kahalan, Avigdor, The Heights of Courage: A Tank Leader's War on the Golan, Praeger Publishers, New York, NY, 1992.

15. Marines, 1996 Almanac, January 1996.
16. Means , John, United States Department of Defense Fact File, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C., 1993.
17. Perry, William J., Annual Report to the President and the Congress, United States Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., February 1995.
18. Riennerth, Janice G., The Impact of Male Absenteeism on the Structure and Organization of the Military Family, University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1977.
19. Segal, Mady W., "The Military and the Family as Greedy Institutions," Armed Forces and Society, Vol. 13, No.1, p. 9, Fall 1986.
20. Stewart, Nora K., Mates and Muchachos, Unit Cohesion in the Falklands/Malvinas War, Brassey's (US), INC., Mclean, Virginia, 1991.
21. United States Marine Corps, Fleet Marine Force Organization, 1992, Washington, D.C., 1992.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER 8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN RD., STE 0944 FT. BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060-6218 | 2 |
| 2. | LIBRARY, CODE 13 NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93943-5101 | 2 |
| 3. | DIRECTOR, TRAINING AND EDUCATION MCCDC, CODE C46 1019 ELLIOT RD. QUANTICO, VIRGINIA 22134-5027 | 1 |
| 4. | DIRECTOR, MARINE CORPS RESEARCH CENTER MCCDC, CODE C40RC 2040 BROADWAY STREET QUANTICO, VA 22134-5130 | 2 |
| 5. | DIRECTOR, STUDIES AND ANALYSIS DIVISION MCCDC, CODE C45 3300 RUSSELL ROAD QUANTICO, VA 22134-5130 | 1 |
| 6. | PROFESSOR ALICE CRAWFORD CODE SM/CR NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93943 | 4 |
| 7. | PROFESSOR MARK J. EITELBERG CODE SM/EB NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93943 | 4 |
| 8. | CAPTAIN STEPHEN A. LAWSON 4212 CENTRAL AVE. MIDDLETOWN, OHIO 45042 | 2 |